COT MEETING MINUTES	DRAFT

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Thursday, June 1, 2017   **9:00 AM - 4:00 PM**

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

CONFERENCE ROOM 119

MEMBERS PRESENT
Michael Baumstark
Raymond Billotte
Michael Brown *(Peter Swann, proxy)*
James Conlogue
Chris Hale
Michael Jeanes
Gary Krcmarik
John Lucas
Ron Overholt
John Pelander, *Chair*
John Rezzo
Tivo Romero
Christopher Staring*
Virlynn Tinnell

MEMBERS ABSENT
Bennett Cooper
Paul J. Faith
Roxanne Song Ong

GUESTS
Alexis Allen, *Tempe Muni Court*
Jackie Barrett, *TAC*
Michael Cimino, *PACC*
Cristina Dinchak, *Chandler Muni Court*
Tina Mattison, *Pima County Juvenile Court*
Ken DeWitt, *Navajo County IT*
Julie Dybas, *CACC*
Chris Phelps, *Cyber Subcommittee*
Van Le, *Gilbert Muni Court*
Nate Marler, *Court of Appeals, Div 2*
Joseph Olcavage, *Scottsdale Muni Court*
Jayne Pendergast, *TAC*
Jamie Ross, *Courthouse News*
Debi Schaefer, *Tempe Muni Court*
B. Don Taylor, *Phoenix Muni Court*
Adam Walterson, *Gilbert Muni Court*
* indicates appeared by telephone

AOC STAFF
Jennifer Albright, *CSD*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Catherine Clarich, *CSD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Kevin Kluge, *Finance*
Denise Lundin, *ITD*
Kat Nguyen, *ITD*
Pamela Peet, *ITD*
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *CSD*

COT MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS	Hon. John Pelander, Chair

Vice Chief Justice John Pelander, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) annual meeting to order just after 9:00 a.m. He welcomed members and the public and then conducted a roll call of members in the room and on the phone for the record. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed before the chair updated members on several items, including:

- An overview of the topics being discussed in the meeting and the progression of discussions through the day, including some procedural details;
- The importance of heightened awareness about cybersecurity in the wake of the recent "Wannacry" worldwide ransomware event;
- News about FY18 budget outcomes and the re-appointment process for members; as well as
- Recognition of COT, subcommittee, code standardization, and user group members for their continued service and guidance at the statewide level.

The chair then called members' attention to the minutes from the November 20, 2016 meeting.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2016 Commission on Technology meeting, as written. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 17-01

IT STRATEGIC ROADMAP	Mr. Karl Heckart

Justice Pelander introduced Karl Heckart, chief information officer (CIO) for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), to set the stage for the planning effort. Karl began his twenty-first annual planning meeting with a broad view of Moore's Law and the effect it will have on the technology landscape over the next five to ten years. He highlighted business casualties of the digital tsunami, blockchain technology, affordable smart machines, artificial intelligence, and machines acting on sensory input, then asked whether courts might become obsolete over time like so many other entrenched businesses in recent memory.

With that background, Karl shared details about various opportunities in the *Fair Justice for All* recommendations that have clear technology implications. He also mentioned technology debt courts are still struggling to overcome, budget/talent shortages, as well as some ways a federated court system and government committees slow innovation. He closed by sharing a list of key technology initiatives affecting courts including managing the profusion of digital data, leveraging big data, retiring technology debt to be able to move forward, looking more to the cloud for infrastructure and services, and moving off of monolithic automation systems.

STRATEGIC PROJECTS REVIEW/UPDATES	Subcommittee Chairs

e-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE	Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Director of AOC's Court Services Division, provided the progress of eCourt- / eServices-related projects over the previous year, including recent data about electronic filings submitted by jurisdiction. He listed various enhancements made to public-facing systems over the past year then focused on activities being undertaken to integrate the existing AZTurboCourt-using courts into the next-generation eUniversa e-filing product. He acknowledged the challenges endured by Yavapai Superior Court with adoption of eBench and eFiling before those programs expanded to Mohave Superior Court in the past few weeks. Ron Overholt reported progress with adoption of eBench on additional benches at Pima Superior Court and issues the court recently raised with the vendor, Mentis.

Marcus also discussed activities leading to the soft launch of eAccess that will enable purchase of documents and data remotely, now that Rule-123-compliant filtering is in place and being tested. He showed some sample screens from the program as they appear today, the usage disclaimers, and a sample of the document preview feature. The chair pointed out the amount of time consumed to ensure confidentiality will be strictly preserved when eAccess opens for business.

Marcus ended with a brief request for members to support changes proposed to ACJA 1-506 necessary to address the multi-vendor e-filing model.

	PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE	Mr. Bob Macon

Mr. Bob Macon, staff member for the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC), listed accomplishments in automation from the past year and anticipated progress for next year in various juvenile and adult probation statewide automation systems: JOLTSaz, legacy JOLTS, APETS, CASAaz, AZYAS, and JWI. Mike Cimino, Deputy Adult Probation Chief, added detail about probation automation activities at Maricopa Superior Court before Tina Mattison, Deputy Court Administrator for Pima Juvenile Court, did the same for Pima Superior Court activities.

	ERR&D UPDATE	Ms. Cathy Clarich

Ms. Cathy Clarich, AOC Court Services Division (CSD) Caseflow Manager, updated members on the progress with implementing the records retention and destruction policies since taking on the project in Fall 2016. She introduced Denise Lundin, the CSD Business Analyst who is also the electronic records retention and destruction (ERR&D) point of contact for courts. Cathy described the project scope as deletion of electronic data that has met its retention period pursuant to ACJA § 3-402 and ACJA § 4-302 including both AZTEC and AJACS CMS data, records held in the data warehouse, as well as public access data. The project scope also includes tracking destruction plans that have been submitted by non-supported courts that have implemented their own case management systems such as Maricopa Superior, Pima Superior, and certain limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts.

Cathy shared her understanding of two particular issues with destruction of juvenile case records recently raised by Pima Superior Court and pending further research by AOC Juvenile Justice Services Division and probation committees. In terms of AJACS courts, Cathy stated that she

does not anticipate deleting any juvenile records until the end of FY18 at the earliest due to concentration on limited jurisdiction courts until then.

She focused attention on a three-phased approach to automated destruction starting with limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts that have transitioned to AJACS and detailed the steps in the AZTEC deletion process. She provided details about the AJACS deletion process currently being piloted by Apache Junction Municipal Court. She pointed out that the queue in AJACS is currently only available in the LJ AJACS application but will be available for general jurisdiction (GJ) courts to use in Version 6.0.

Cathy called attention to issues regarding the retention schedule, particularly in relation to the justice courts' criminal felony matters as well as denied protective orders. The short retention periods are proving problematic for calculation and verification of judicial productivity credits (JPCs). She also identified a list of issues encountered during the deletion process thus far including the tangle caused by integration, reluctance of certain courts to delete, needs for modification, and the request for juvenile records exemption. Cathy ended by cautioning application developers to take records retention and destruction into account when they plan new automation.

	COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE	Hon. Michael Pollard

Judge Michael Pollard, chair of the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC), began the project update with the announcement of his retirement from the committee to devote his attention to funding Veterans Courts. He provided project oversight details before turning to significant accomplishments of trial-court-related projects. He then discussed future considerations for trial courts that were reported from a recent CACC meeting devoted to future trends, emphasizing the importance of advanced court technology, reducing the technology gap between the "haves" and "have-nots," anticipating an increasing cultural emphasis on transparency at the expense of operational confidentiality, handling more legal matters administratively, "Bring Your Own Device" becoming the prevalent mode of operating with technology, and needing a statewide continuity of operations plan to be formalized for court technology.

He then summarized various major items for COT consideration, including
•   The continued emphasis on AZTEC replacement,
•   Continuation of funding for LJ CMS training and rollout effort,
•   Implementation of revenue-enhancing projects,
•   Placing more importance on prioritization of resources and development for GJ CMS enhancements, and
•   Completion of the JOLTSaz rural rollout.

Judge Pollard continued by informing members about several key challenges and future items to prepare for including ensuring that smaller and less funded courts benefit from technology innovations, focusing on making "smart" court forms and e-fileable content, considering the several macro trends and future implications noted earlier, and warned about the coming tidal wave of digital exhibits.

COT MEETING MINUTES

DRAFT

Justice Pelander took a moment to recognize Judge Pollard's twenty-plus years of dedication and loyal service to the Commission on Technology, the Court Automation Coordinating Committee. With that, Judge Pollard was presented with an award and certificate as a token of appreciation, and the Large Volume Courts Committee then presented him with an award and certificate as tokens of appreciation.

	TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), provided an update on the committee's activities from this past year, including the move from Windows 8.1 to Windows 10, concentration on security assessments against the set of statewide security standards published last year, implementation of Sophos EndPoint Security for virus and malware prevention statewide, continuation of network capacity improvements, creating an eNotification centralized service with Twilio to transmit messages to the public from courts, and preparations for the upgrade to Microsoft Office 16 this summer or early fall.

Karl also informed members in detail about several key challenges related to court technology, including:

- Transition of software vendors to subscription models with rapid releases and shortening support cycles,
- Staffing levels insufficient to meet local, state, and security demands,
- Problems with prioritization,
- Difficulty sustaining sufficient funding to operate,
- Keeping up with end-of-life technology costs,
- Dealing with increasing network bandwidth consumption and a possible need to curtail certain personal use,
- Assessing the aging infrastructure risk, unsupportable applications, and resulting limited innovation capability, and
- Maintaining adequate training to maintain local technology versus pushing it to the cloud.

Karl acknowledged the importance of increased agile development necessary to deliver needed innovations faster, then presented the idea of working together on dedicated product teams, He declared the need to move off of monolithic systems and to start thinking of reusable services instead decoupled from monolithic systems but using central repositories for data and documents, CCI and CDR, with shared services.

He listed TAC's plans for FY 2018, including updating the enterprise technology standards, better addressing security with data sharing standards, looking at cloud use best practices and the most cost-effective ways to harness it, improving solution sharing, and spending even more time on security. Karl also mentioned a refresh of the e-filing and court automation code sections to be submitted to COT for approval. Karl ended by answering questions about the code updates and role of Jury+ as a statewide application.

	PROJECT MONITORING DIRECTION	Mr. Stewart Bruner

Commission on Technology Meeting Minutes | June 1, 2017 — 4

Staff member Stewart Bruner refreshed members' memories about the issue raised by CACC last year that ACJA § 1-109 authorizes the Commission to monitor projects, but does not delineate how that should be accomplished. COT has delegated project monitoring tasks to CACC members, who in turn requested specific direction, leading to inauguration of an ad-hoc subcommittee. Stewart walked members through the four key guidelines for project monitoring and displayed his mapping of current projects among the four guidelines for impact. Stewart answered questions about the listed projects, the symbols used in the matrix, and the approach for any projects not specifically listed in the mapping.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve the guidelines for projects to monitor, as presented, leaving the frequency and detail to CACC. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 17-03

	CYBERSECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl outlined the recent growth of various types of cyberattacks and scams, especially those targeting BYOD mobile devices and ransomware. He warned that perimeter defenses are no longer sufficient to protect court assets. He shared the general status of information and network security for the judicial branch ascertained by the efforts of the subcommittee, since COT is a public body. Issues exposed by the assessment effort last year are either addressed already or have plans in place and target dates to address them. Network vulnerability scanning and remediation will continue at least twice each year going forward for all courts. Karl summarized discussions he held with CIOs of cities and counties about the court security standards and vulnerability scanning requirement. He ended by sharing a list of the most critical items necessary to improve the security posture of the courts and emphasized that security is not a project but an ongoing discipline being baked into the culture of courts in various ways he described.

Karl described an issue raised by Maricopa Superior Court concerning the current wording of Minimum Security Standard 2.14 and suggested a change to the period of time files left behind by terminated employees must remain before deletion, accompanied by a recommendation that the files be moved to a more secure location while awaiting the passage of the longer time period.

	OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW	Mr. Kevin Kluge

Mr. Kevin Kluge, chief financial officer for the AOC, shared the financial status of the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) and showed a projection of actual revenues against predicted revenues, revenues against expenses, and the projected remaining fund balance at the end of FY2018. Kevin provided the larger context beyond JCEF for the automation budget in its entirety, funded 42 percent by JCEF. Diminishing revenues with less than corresponding automation spending reductions will require shifting funding from sources other than JCEF, like FARE. These funds are also projected to diminish over the next few years which may prompt revisiting ACAP device fees eventually. Kevin walked members through the components of the three main tiers of the budget and major items included within each of them.

He described the strategies for handling expenditures in FY18 predicated on his assumption of projected revenues remaining unchanged from the 3.4 percent decrease in FY17. The remaining JCEF balance at the end of FY18 is projected to be only $176K, an amount allowing for only a 1.5 percent margin of error. More spending authority exists than funds available to spend.

In response to questions, Kevin explained the reasoning behind predicting FY18 JCEF revenues will match FY17 numbers and how the recently approved court security fee will take some time to accrue a sufficient balance in JCEF to fund projects.

IT STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FY18-FY21	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl updated members on the challenges that prioritization is designed to address and the status of each one of last year's priority projects before reviewing the agreed priorities from last year. He then provided reasons for and against moving the priority of revenue-enhancing projects higher in the list. Members shared their individual reasons for either moving the item higher in the priority list or leaving it in last year's position. Karl described the implications of the priority list in the event of a revenue shortfall during the coming year. Rural general jurisdiction (GJ) representatives shared their concerns about moving AJACS GJ enhancements lower in the priority list. The chair wrapped up the discussion by asking for a motion one way or the other concerning the priority list.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to adopt the list of IT strategic priorities as presented. The motion passed with 8 yea votes and 6 nay votes.	TECH 17-04

DECISIONS	Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl refreshed members' memories about the budget numbers and tier breakdowns previously described by Kevin Kluge and explained various items contained in the costs, including approximately 2600 hours of development time for enhancements to statewide systems, now that no vendor is involved, as well as continued field trainer funding.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve the funding for existing operations and continued development of previously authorized statewide systems, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 17-05

Karl highlighted the wording change to Security Standard 2.14 to lengthen the required retention period in order to accommodate the notice of action in A.R.S § 12-821.01.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to recommend amending the wording of Security Standard 2.14 to AJC for approval. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 17-06

Karl then reviewed the changes in ACJA 1-501, Court Automation Standards, including a new subsection that documents the process for obtaining a local exception from a statewide automation system or required functionality. In answer to a member's question, he explained the

reasoning behind leaving the Jury+ product name in the code section while removing Appellamation and AZTurboCourt.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to recommend to AJC the proposed wording changes to ACJA § 1-501, as presented. The motion passed with 1 nay vote.	TECH 17-07

Karl next mentioned the largely editorial changes proposed for ACJA 1-506, Filing and Management of Electronic Court Documents, that had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting for their review.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to recommend to AJC proposed wording changes to ACJA § 1-506, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 17-08

Karl reminded members of the issues raised by juvenile justice practitioners related to ERR&D and recommended a moratorium be placed on destruction of any juvenile records held in court case management systems until June 30, 2018 to allow the juvenile justice community time to craft a solution to the issues raised.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to place a moratorium on destruction of juvenile case records in case management systems through June 30, 2018 to enable policy issues to be resolved. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 17-09

FY2018-2020 INDIVIDUAL COUNTY AUTOMATION PLANS	Mr. Stewart Bruner

Mr. Stewart Bruner, Manager of IT Strategic Planning for AOC, shared the larger context of the strategic business planning, IT planning, and COT's direction regarding the frequency of plan updates, including the "lite" process employed for urban counties this year. Since COT did not meet in February, he highlighted the several prominent business themes running through plans this year, including
- Enhancing systems and processes;
- Improving court performance and time standards;
- Increasing public access to court records and services online;
- Workforce retention and development
- Improving or expanding justice integration and record sharing; and
- Ensuring continuity of operations.

Technology themes running through plans this year, include
- Addressing out-of-support operating systems, productivity tools, and database management tools in relation to architecture targets;
- Numerous new projects for network audit scanning and remediation;
- Continued growth of video projects for various purposes and resultant need for increased bandwidth;

- Equipment refreshes for courtroom audio and video equipment;
- Pursuit of "call out" auto-dialer systems to reduce failures to appear and failures to pay;
- Continued reliance on ftp/sftp for scheduled production transfers of data;
- Continued movement toward local solutions and resources for crafting ad hoc reports; and
- Slightly increasing project backlogs for local IT resources, year over year, with continued turnover.

He reminded members that his presentation details selected accomplishments and concerns from the individual plans; that those concerns are conveyed to the presiding judge of the county in a letter from the COT chair; and that, while he makes suggestions, the choice of motion text related to any individual plan is ultimately theirs. Stewart then launched into an abbreviated, county-by-county, strategic plan summarization effort.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve Cochise County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020, with a concern noted for use of outside financial programs that will not have their data converted to AJACS, creating business risk. The motion passed unanimously with Judge Conlogue abstaining.	TECH-17-10

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020 with a concern noted for use of OmniForms that will not be continued in AJACS. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH-17-11

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve the Greenlee County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020 with a concern noted for the continued use of a local probation tracking program which needs to be transitioned to commercial software to ensure continued support. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH-17-12

John Lucas shared very sad news about the sudden passing of the developer who both created and supported the local probation tracking program.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020 with a concern noted for the inability to upgrade FTR Windows 8.1 PCs to Windows 10 to remain in long-term support. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH-17-13

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan "Lite Update"	TECH-17-14

	for FY 2018-2020, with concerns noted for the continued use of retirement architecture items posing security and support risk; production data/functions residing in MS-Access at the Clerk of the Superior Court posing business risk; incomplete statewide interfaces for Mesa, Tempe, and Gilbert; and numerous courts still using ftp/sftp for production data transfers, posing business risk.. The motion passed unanimously with Michael Jeanes and Ray Billotte abstaining.	

He passed along a concern that little detail exists in the plan updates concerning two very significant projects underway in Maricopa County: The Clerk of Court's RFR System replacement and the modular, .NET porting to iCISng by Court Administration. Both Ray Billotte and Michael Jeanes stated their willingness to have CACC monitor the projects.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020, with concerns noted for applications and data outside of AZTEC that will not be converted to AJACS and continued use of ftp/sftp for production data transfers, posing business risk. The motion passed unanimously with Virlynn Tinnell abstaining.**	**TECH-17-15**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve the Navajo County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH-17-16**

In response to Stewart's stated fears about lack of technical support for increasing complexity of operations in the paperless world, Navajo County CIO Ken DeWitt indicated that the court recently negotiated an agreement for a portion of a County IT resource to provide dedicated court IT support starting July 1.

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020, with a concern noted for continued use of ftp/sftp for production data transfers, posing business risk. The motion passed unanimously with Ron Overholt and Chris Hale abstaining.**	**TECH-17-17**

MOTION	**A motion was made and seconded to approve Yuma County Courts' Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2020, noting that AJACS only integrates with the OnBase EDMS and that selection of another EDMS requires an exception to be granted by COT. The motion passed unanimously.**	**TECH-17-18**

COT MEETING MINUTES

Stewart closed by displaying a timeline of the major milestones in this year's planning process along with the metrics for late versus on-time plans at each phase in the process.

MEETING REVIEW/WRAPUP	Hon. John Pelander

Justice Pelander reminded members of the decisions made during today's meeting that are headed for AJC later in the month and also shared the next two COT meeting dates.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC	Hon. John Pelander

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, the chair entertained a motion to adjourn at 2:40 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:	September 07, 2017	AOC – Conference Room 106
	November 09, 2017	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B

MEETING ADJOURNED	2:40 PM